

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 14 – 16, 19, 21 and 25 are amended, claims 1 – 13 and 22 - 24 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 14 – 21 and 25 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

Rejection of claims 1 – 3, 8 11 – 13, 16, 19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Kamatani et al.

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1 – 3, 8, 11 – 13, 16, 19, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kamatani et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0068526 A1) (hereinafter, “Kamatani”). The Examiner alleged that Kamatani discloses iridium compounds represented by formula L2ML’ and/or L3M for use in the emitting layer of an organic electroluminescent display device. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 – 13 and 22 – 24 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 14 – 15 and 25 are amended to cover species that are not described in Kamatani et al. Claims 16 – 21 are amended to depend from claim 14. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 1 – 4, 8 11 – 17, 19, 21 and 22 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Kamatani et al.

At page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1 – 4, 8, 11 – 17, 19, 21, 22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tsuboyama et al. (European Patent 1 239 526 A2) (hereinafter, “Tsuboyama”). The Examiner alleged that Tsuboyama discloses compounds represented by the formula L3M for use in the emitting layer of an organic electroluminescent display device. The Examiner alleged that many of the compounds defined in the tables on pages 9 – 24 meet the limitations of the phosphorescent dopant as defined in present claims 1, 2, 12 and 13. The Examiner further alleged that compounds 1, 349, 522 and 523 of Tsuboyama meet the limitation of the phosphorescent dopant as defined in claim 14, 15 and 25. In particular, the Examiner alleged that Tsuboyama’s compound 1 is the compound of chemical formula 23 of the present application, that Tsuboyama’s compound 349 is the compound of chemical formula 24 of the present application, that Tsuboyama’s compound 522 is the compound of chemical formula 30 of the present application and that Tsuboyama’s compound 523 is the compound of chemical formula 25 of the present application. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 – 13 and 22 – 24 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 14 –

15 and 25 are amended to cover species that are not described in Tsuboyama et al. Claims 16 – 21 are amended to depend from claim 14. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 16 – 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Kamatani et al. and further in view of Park et al. and Yu et al.

At page 6 of the Office Action, claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 16 – 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamatani et al. as applied to claims 1 – 3, 8, 11 – 13, 16, 19, 21 and 22 above, and further in view of Park et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0042848 A1) (hereinafter, “Park”) and Yu et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2004/0094768 A1) (hereinafter, “Yu”). The Examiner alleged that Kamatani discloses iridium compounds represented by formulae L2ML’ and L3M. The Examiner acknowledged that Kamatani does not teach a full-color display device having red, green and blue emitting layers. The Examiner alleged that Park and Yu disclose full-color display devices having red, green and blue emitting layers in which at least one emitter is a phosphorescent emitter and at least one emitter is a fluorescent emitter and that the blue emitter may be a fluorescent emitting layer. Regarding claims 9 and 20, the Examiner alleged that Park teaches the use of a hole blocking layer over the phosphorescent layers. Regarding claims 10 and 18, the Examiner alleged that Yu et al. teaches that the blue emitter layer may be formed over the red and green emitter layers. The Examiner further alleged that a full-color organic electroluminescent display device comprising a phosphorescent dopant was known in the art at the time of the invention, as alleged 14 demonstrated by Kamatani et al. and that the structural features of the device as set for the in claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 18, and 20 were known in the art for full-color organic electroluminescent display devices as allegedly demonstrated by Park et al. and Yu et al. The Examiner took the position that it would have been obvious to make a full-color display device using a phosphorescent dopant as allegedly taught by Kamatani et al using structural features allegedly known in the art of full-color display devices as alleged disclosed by Park et al. and Yu et al. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As noted above, claims 1 – 13 and 22 – 24 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 14 – 15 and 25 are amended to cover species that are not described in Kamatani et al. Claims 16 – 18 and 20 are amended to depend from claim 14. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 9, 10, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Tsuboyama et al. and further in view of Park et al. and Yu et al.

At page 7 of the Office Action, claims 9, 10, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuboyama as applied to claims 1 – 4, 8, 11 – 17, 19, 21, 22 and 25 above, and further in view of Park and Yu. The Examiner acknowledged that Tsuboyama does not teach a full-color display device having red, green and blue emitting layers. The Examiner repeated the allegations mentioned above regarding Park and Yu. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 – 13 and 22 – 24 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 14 – 15 and 25 are amended to cover species that are not described in Tsuboyama. Claims 18 – 20 are amended to depend from claim 14. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: Sept 14, 2007

By: 
Ralph T. Webb
Registration No. 33,047

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-951